

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated December 21, 2011, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1, 3, 5-15, 17 and 18 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1, 3 and 5-17 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claims 1 and 17 are unclear because they recite “display a type” in line 7 and recite “display a type” again in line 21, but appear to correspond to both images and pages. The remaining claims are rejected based on their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 17.

The Applicants have amended the recitation of “display a type” in line 21 of independent claims 1 and 17 to recite, instead, “display the type”. Please note that both expressions noted above represent the same type, for example, “Aomori prefecture” shown in Fig. 6. As amended, claims 1 and 17 are now believed to be definite. Withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony et al. (US 2005/0091596, hereafter “Anthony”) in view of Gemmell et al. (US 7,334,195, hereafter “Gemmell”), and further in view of Hayakawa (US 6,741,268, hereafter “Hayakawa”).

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 17 to more clearly distinguish the claims from the cited prior art. For example, independent claim 1 (as amended) recites *inter alia* the following features:

“An image file list display device that displays on a screen a list of a plurality of image files classified by a series of different types, the image file list display device comprising:...

the image file list display device further comprises:

a display area calculating unit operable to obtain the number of the pages and calculate the size according to the obtained number of the pages; and

a data controlling unit operable to extract, from each of the image files, attribute information added to each of the image files,

wherein the classification type display unit is operable to display the type corresponding

to the pages in the area of the size calculated by the display area calculating unit and indicated in the attribute information of the image files corresponding to the scaled-down images displayed on the pages, the attribute information being extracted by the data controlling unit.” (Emphasis added).

The features emphasized above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claim 17 (as amended). That is, independent claim 17 is a corresponding method claim having steps directed to the features emphasized above in independent claim 1.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 17) is believed to be distinguished from the cited prior art in that an image file list display device includes a data controlling unit or method that extracts, from each of a number of image files, attribute information added to each of the image files. A classification type display unit or step then displays a type corresponding to pages in an area of a calculated size and indicated in the attribute information of the image files. The type displayed also corresponds to scaled-down images displayed on the pages.

Independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended, respectively, to clarify that the image file list display device or method includes a data controlling unit or step that extracts, from each of the image files, attribute information. Additionally, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to clarify that the type displayed by a classification type display unit or step is a type extracted by the data controlling unit or step and indicated in the attribute information, and corresponds to the scaled-down images displayed on the pages. The features added to independent claims 1 and 17 are fully supported by the Applicants’ disclosure (see paragraphs [0212]-[0221]).

With the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1 and 17), it is possible to extract attribute information from the image files, and generate, from the attribute information, a type that should be displayed on a screen.

In the Office Action, although the Examiner relies on the combination of Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa for disclosing all the features of independent claims 1 and 17, the Examiner relies specifically on Hayakawa for disclosing or suggesting the features of the image file list display device emphasized above in independent claim 1 (and similarly recited in independent claim 17). In particular, the Examiner relies on col. 11, line 56-col. 12, line 33; and Figs. 9 and 10 of Hayakawa. However, the Applicants assert that col. 11, line 56-col. 12, line

33; and Figs. 9 and 10 of Hayakawa fail to disclose or suggest the features now recited in independent claims 1 and 17 (as amended).

As noted above, independent claim 1 now recites the following features:

“the image file list display device further comprises: ...

a display area calculating unit operable to obtain the number of the pages and calculate the size according to the obtained number of the pages; and

a data controlling unit operable to extract, from each of the image files, attribute information added to each of the image files, and the classification type display unit is operable to display the type corresponding to the pages in the area of the size calculated by the display area calculating unit and indicated in the attribute information of the image files corresponding to the scaled-down images displayed on the pages, the attribute information being extracted by the data controlling unit.” (Emphasis added).

The features noted above with reference to independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claim 17.

Hayakawa in col. 11, line 56-col. 12, line 33 describes Figs. 9 and 10. And, Hayakawa, with reference to Fig. 9, discloses an overlapping display and a class tag display. As shown in Fig 9, a tag is displayed according to a setting of a tag display mode. If an overlapping display is made, the hierarchical relation is defined and the setting of overlapping is made.

For example, when each tag belongs to any of a number of classes, it is checked whether or not a class tag is displayed with normal tags. If the class tag is displayed first, the relation of each tag belonging to the class is defined. Subsequently, a tag indicating the content of a class to which the tag of the page displayed in the tag display area belongs is displayed in each tag display area.

Hayakawa, with reference to Fig 10, discloses a class tag displayed in a tag display area. As shown in Fig. 10, the total page number of electronic information is seven pages and the tags shown belong to different classes (e.g., class A, class B or class C). To indicate the end of a certain class, a class tag is made to overlap a next page tag. Then, it is clear that the third page is next to the second page, and to the class A.

As noted above, Hayakawa (i.e., with reference to Fig. 9) merely discloses that a tag can belong to any of a number of classes, and the position of a class tag is checked. For example, if the class tag is displayed first, the relation of each tag belonging to the class is defined.

Although Hayakawa (i.e., in col. 11, line 56-col. 12, line 33) discloses checking a class tag in relation to a tag, nothing in the reference discloses a data controlling unit or step that extracts, from image files, attribute information added to each of the image files, as recited in independent claims 1 and 17.

Additionally, Hayakawa (i.e., with reference to Fig. 10) does disclose displaying a tag in a tag display area indicating a content of a class to which the tag of a page displayed in the tag display area belongs.

However, the reference still fails to disclose or suggest that the tag is displayed based on extracted attribute information of an image file corresponding to the scaled-down images displayed on the pages, as recited in independent claims 1 and 17 (as amended).

In the Office Action, Anthony and Gemmell are not relied on for disclosing or suggesting the features noted above in independent claims 1 and 17. That is, the Examiner relies specifically on Hayakawa for disclosing or suggesting these features. And, based on the deficiencies noted above in Hayakawa, no combination of Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features of independent claims 1 and 17 (as amended). Likewise, no combination of Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features of claims 3, 5-15 and 18 by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 17.

In the Office Action, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa, and further in view of Moore et al. (US 7,409,644, hereafter “Moore”).

As noted above, the combination of Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, Moore fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa. Accordingly, no combination of Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the features of claim 16 at least by virtue of its dependency from independent claim 1. Likewise, no combination of Anthony, Gemmell and Hayakawa would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 3, 5-15 and 18 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 17.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the outstanding Office Action, and pass the present application to issue.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any issues remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Naoki TANAKA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By 2012.03.20 10:49:32 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt

Registration No. 45,794

Attorney for Applicants

MDP/lkd
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 20, 2012